

**WARRINGTON TOWNSHIP PLANNING COMMISSION**  
**April 21, 2022 – 7:00 P.M.**  
**MINUTES**

**CALL TO ORDER**

**PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

**MEMBERS**

Richard Rycharski	Chairman	Present
William Connolly	Vice-Chairman	Present
Herb Rubenstein	Secretary	Present
Ted Cicci	Member	Present
Shirley Yannich	Member	Present
Shawn McGuigan	Member	Present
Bob Watts	Member	Present
Vince Evans	Alternate	Present
Fred Gaines	Alternate	Present
Mary Stover, P.E.	Township Engineer, CKS	
Roy Rieder	Zoning Officer	
Christian Jones	Township Assistant Manager	
Doreen Curtin	Deputy Zoning Officer	

**PUBLIC COMMENT – no public comment**

**AGENDA ITEMS**

**1.Approval of Minutes**

All minutes were approved by unanimous vote.

- a. March 03, 2022 – Mr. Cicci made the motion, seconded by Mr. Evans
- b. March 17, 2022 – Mr. Cicci made the motion, seconded by Mr. Evans
- c. April 07, 2022 – Mr. Cicci made the motion, seconded by Mr. Evans

**2.Old Business**

- a. None

**3.New Business**

- a. Review and, if appropriate, make recommendations for a final minor subdivision plan for the Powell Tract located at 3360 Bristol Road in the RA Zoning District.

Scott Meese, the engineer for the Applicant described the property, structures, noted sizes of lots and how the property would be subdivided. The Applicant decided to make only two lots to prevent additional subdivision in the future. Discussion ensued with a description of the easement for access and how the driveway would be designed and managed.

Ms. Yannich had questions regarding the driveway accessibility, the renovation of the barn and how that would evolve into a single-family dwelling.

Mr. Rycharski asked for clarification regarding the subdivision line and how it would affect potential sale of the lot. He asked for clarification on how water sanitary disposal needs would be installed and/or managed and discussion ensued. It was noted that there were two existing wells but there would be a need for updated sanitary systems.

Further discussion ensued regarding additional concerns such as areas where soil would be suitable for a septic system and how the installation of systems could potentially affect trees and other disturbances.

The Planning Commission moved to a discussion of the CKS review. It was noted there were many “will comply” with the recommendations of the Township Engineer. Those decisions were noted as follows:

Item 1. Will comply

Item 2. Will comply

Item 3. Wetlands, Applicant agrees to follow the existing water course

Item 4. Applicant agreed to pay the fee in lieu of open space.

Item 5. Applicant agreed to move the existing fence that crosses over property line when the new lot sells.

Item 6. Applicant agreed to comply with providing an access easement.

The Planning Commission noted they wanted to see an easement for solar panels.

The Subdivision plan will show compliance as follows:

1. Will comply
2. Will continue to use driveway. Noted that state road would need a ROW. Discussed the issue of the shared driveway. Roy discussed the shared driveway and noted he believed PennDOT would prefer a shared driveway. Bill noted it was a good idea and that the issue needed to be clear in the written documents. Discussion ensued regarding the issue of parking and creating enough parking spaces for each dwelling. Mr. Rycharski and Mr. Connolly discussed deed restrictions regarding the fence and driveway.
3. Jon Constanza discussed some of the technical issues of the project. He discussed solar panels and energy systems and described what was installed. M  
  
He made additional comments on the intent of the subdivision, noting the desire of the Applicant to have separate guest quarters on the property which is not a permitted use by ordinance. He further represented the desire of the Applicant to ensure that each of the parcels were self-supporting.
4. In order to successfully manage storm water, the Applicant will reduce parking spaces to only meet the minimum requirements as prescribed by ordinance and have the re-engineered plans submitted for review to CKS.
5. Mr. Connolly recommended engaging a surveyor to correct the location of the garage and the barn as it shows on the plans. He noted there is an overlap with the garage and barn.

6. The Planning Commission felt the waiver requests submitted by the Applicant were reasonable.

Mr. Connolly asked about planning modules for the water and sewer, and discussion ensued.

Mr. Connolly addressed the issue of open space. The Planning Commission suggested the Applicant consider a conservation easement over waterways, wetlands and sensitive areas rather than the fee in lieu of open space and the Applicant was more than agreeable.

There were no objections to the letter from the traffic engineer.

The motion to approve by Mr. Connolly with the following conditions:

1. Correct the barn/garage layout
2. Design and submit a stormwater maintenance agreement that meets with the approval of the Township Solicitor
3. Finalize the issue of the fencing and the parking and that it be deed restricted
4. Remove the two parking spaces as discussed on lot 1
5. Provide a planning module for water and sewer
6. Provide documentation for the conservation easement
7. Meet all the compliance measures as noted by the Township Engineers review letter dated April 14, 2022
8. The Planning Commission recommends all 4 waiver requests.

The motion was seconded by Ms. Yannich and approved unanimously.

b. Review and comment on a sketch plan application for a pad site at the northwesterly corner of the intersection of Easton Road and Oakfield Road in the BZ zoning district.

Present for the Applicant were:

Ron Gundlach, attorney for the Applicant  
Chirag Thakkar, engineer for the Applicant  
Peter Miller, the Applicant

Mr. Gundlach addressed the board regarding the revision of plans. Mr. Thakkar, briefly reviewed the revisions. They are as noted:

1. Building size reduced to bring parking into compliance 4900 – 3947 sq ft
2. Incorporated a bypass lane
3. Moved trash enclosure to the side
4. Incorporated sidewalks
- 5.

Mr. Rycharski asked about retaining wall and Mr. Thakkar noted the wall is a cut wall – 2-4 feet in height. He noted the reason for the wall is to address the topographic changes in the slope. There were questions about the wall and limit of disturbance and discussion ensued.

Mr. Connolly expressed concern about the plan for tree removal. Engineer noted trees would have to be taken down to level out grade change. Mr. Connolly noted that trees intended to be cleared are already in the required buffer and discussion ensued.

Mr. Rycharski expressed concerns over the elevations and the buffering and how overall grading and buffering would be affecting the project. Discussed the location and diameter of trees. Mr. Rycharski

expressed the Planning Commission's concerns over tree removal and noted they wanted existing trees for buffering. Mr. Miller agreed to survey the trees for further clarity. Owner noted they needed to survey the trees.

Mr. Rycharski asked the Applicant if he had a scoping meeting with PennDOT to address concerns regarding traffic entering and exiting on the state road. A discussion ensued regarding concerns with PennDOT requirements and truck access and how travel would be affected on 611 with the possible construction of a left turn lane.

Trash enclosure and loading zone issues were discussed. A discussion regarding safe pedestrian movement from the parking spaces to the building also ensued.

Mr. Connolly noted that as submitted, the application would most likely wind up requiring ZHB relief.

Mr. Connolly opened up discussion regarding loading. Mr. Gundlach noted the plans included provisions for loading and unloading trucks, noting concerns such as where the loading door would be located, how loading and unloading would be managed, what type of boxes, etc.

When asked about the specific needs of the potential tenant, Mr. Miller was not able to provide additional information regarding loading for the particular tenant with whom they have been having negotiations citing confidentiality. Mr. Rycharski addressed several other concerns regarding the plans for loading and unloading as submitted by the Applicant, and discussion ensued.

There were additional questions from the Planning Commission about concerns such as:

1. Hours of operation.
2. How hours and movement would affect the neighborhood recommending the Applicant revisit the buffer area regarding soundproofing.
3. A review by the Fire Marshal for safety concerns and building code compliance.
4. How far along were they with a commitment from the tenant
5. How close were they for land development review.
6. How much review was given to buffering and grading of the property.

Mr. Rycharski asked the Applicant to discuss the variances for which they are seeking relief.

The following is a summary of the requested relief:

1. Requirement of a 50' buffer – they are short by 9'
2. Allow front façade to be closer than 50' to the front of the street line.
3. Allow parking to be less than 25' from the street because of t
4. Allow parking access to be set back less than the 15'
5. Allow greater than 15 percent of the spaces to be in the front.
6. Steep slope and buffer area
7. Drive through uses and where it abuts the streets. PennDOT is going to want the left at Oakfield which will require ZHB relief
8. Discussed connections of properties thru PECO
9. Pedestrian crossing and stacking lane
10. Planting strip of 10' between building and parking

A discussion ensued regarding the possibility of a bus stop or other concessions.

Mr. Connolly noted to the Applicant that they should strive to ask for least amount of relief to minimize the request and suggested they review the plan as submitted again to minimize the list.

Mr. Rycharski opened up the floor to public comment

Frederick Hertz, a local resident discussed the issue of the loading zone, requesting clarification on the submitted plans. There was no other public comment.

Mr. Gundlach stated that they will discuss modifications with the Applicant and resubmit the application. The Planning Commission noted that they would want to see the plan revised at least one more time to address the concerns discussed and to provide more clarity. The discussion concluded.

#### **4.Subcommittee Reports**

##### **a. Zoning/SALDO**

Mr. Connolly provided the following information as a summary of the progress:

1. Second full draft of SALDO is supposed to be just before first meeting in May. Is almost complete. Lighting issue incorporated.
2. Working on revision 2 of the Zoning office – especially the sign ordinance. Vince asked about flag signs.

#### **5.Additional Business**

##### **a. Discussion on Planning Commission Goals, Mission, and Structure**

Mr. Rycharski noted that the MPC dictates the roles of the PC. Mr. Connolly added that the bylaws clearly define the mission of the PC and asked that the BOS members clarify what, in addition to those requirements as noted by law, were they looking for in terms of structure. Mr. Gaines responded acknowledging that the PC is not as affected as much as the committees are but discussed the desire of the BOS in ensuring goals and mission were current as they face new challenges with changing conditions.

Mr. Gaines noted that is it a goal of the BOS to have the chairs of all the committees meet and review mission statements and define goals. At this point in the discussion, the PC members discussed goals and the mission and their bylaws. Dr. Diorka noted to the PC that he would like to see the PC extend their knowledge to some of the other committees in helping them shape goals. Mr. Gaines discussed the updating of the comprehensive plan, transportation issues, walkability of the Township and other things that the Township residents are facing. Mr. Rycharski stated they should pull out the comprehensive plan once the SALDO is done. Mr. Gaines also discussed the open space plan and other plans and how do they work with each other. He talked about the possibility of an energy plan.

It was suggested by Mr. Rycharski that the PC put together a one-page document for the BOS to help them understand the nature and structure of a Planning Commission.

##### **b. Discuss delegation of a member of the Planning Commission to serve as liaison to the Environmental Activities Council.**

Mr. Rycharski stated that the EAC has a requirement for a member of the PC to serve on the committee, and Mr. Gaines offered to serve.

##### **c. Warrington Energy Independence and Conservation Plan**

Ms. Yannich discussed the BOS resolution that noted the EAC and PC would work together. She discussed the International Council of Environmental Initiatives. She discussed the action and the plan, including help writing the Environmental Action Plan.

She noted they had an intern that helped set up the plan. The committee collected data on the number of buildings and vehicles to determine energy needs and use.

She discussed the recommended actions to help reach energy conservation goals.

Discussion ensued regarding planning for energy conservation measures for municipal structures.

Roy discussed plans coming in the future before the Planning Commission.

The meeting ended at 9:20pm.

## **6.Next Meeting**

a. May 5, 2022